

### **Remarks/Arguments**

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of this Application. Applicant's representative also thanks the Examiner for taking time to discuss the application. Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-16, 19, 23-25, 34-50 are pending after entry of the present Amendment.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 24 and 25 were objected to because the listing claims were not provided with a proper status. Claims 24 and 25 have been provided with a proper status. Accordingly, Applicants request the objections to claims 24 and 25 be removed.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102:**

The Office has rejected claims 1-16, 19, 21, 23-27, 30, 32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,615,264 to Stoltz et al. (Stoltz). For at least the followings reasons, Stoltz fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, as defined in independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 34.

Stoltz discloses a method and apparatus for authentication and session management for a network with human interface devices (HID) and a service provider. In Stoltz, a user logs onto a system with a token, smart card or other authentication mechanism. The validation process will then proceed with an authentication manager interacting with the HID to accept the token. During authentication, the authentication manager will pass the token presented by the user to an authentication module. The authentication module may accept responsibility for authenticating the user with the token. Once an authentication module authenticates a user, a user is given access to a session which may be running from a previous logon.

Independent claim 1 defines a method for accessing a session. In the method, a first token from a plurality of tokens assigned to a user is converted to an authenticated token. A session is associated with the authenticated token and once the authenticated token is presented, a session can be accessed from a terminal. Furthermore, the method allows any of the plurality of tokens to create the same authenticated token.

Stoltz does not teach Applicant's claimed invention because in Stoltz tokens are not converted to authenticated tokens that are distinct from the initial tokens. In Stoltz, the initial token is passed to an authentication module which authenticates the initial token. The authentication module does not convert the token to a token that is distinct from the initial token, therefore the token that has passed the authentication process in Stoltz is the same as the initial token. Because the authenticated token in Stoltz is the same as the initial token presented to the system, access to a session is based on the information of the initial token. Applicant's claimed invention converts the initial token to an authenticated token which is distinct from the initial token. Therefore, the authenticated token and the initial token in Applicant's claimed invention are not the same. In Applicant's claimed invention it is the different, authenticated token which is presented to a system to gain access to a session not the initial token.

Furthermore, Applicant's claimed invention permits the creation of the different, authenticated token from any token from the plurality of initial tokens. As discussed above, Stoltz's method does not convert initial tokens to authenticated tokens that are distinct from the initial token. Therefore, only if initial tokens are the same, will an authenticated token in Stoltz be the same. Applicant's claimed invention permits different initial tokens to be converted to the same distinct authenticated token. For at least the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 12, 23, and 34 are novel over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention, as defined in claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-16, 19, 23-25, 34, and 42-50 is novel over the cited prior art.

As noted above, the Stoltz fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Consequently, Stoltz can not be regarded under 35 USC §102(e) alone. Instead, Stoltz can only be cited as art under a 35 USC §102(e)/103(c). Stoltz was assigned to the assignee of the present application, and the inventors of the present application also had a duty to assign to the same assignee. Consequently, under 35 USC § 103(c), Stoltz should be removed as a reference against the present application.

Accordingly, the claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-16, 19, 23-25, 34, and 42-50 are submitted to be patentable over the cited art of record. Further, the Examiner has noted that claims 35 - 41 would be

patentable if rewritten to include the features of claim 34. As Stoltz is removed as a reference, the Applicants submit that the claims 34-41 are now patentable.

**Entry of this response:**

The Applicants note that this is a response to a Final Office Action, and also note that no amendments are introduced by way of this response. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this response and pass the case to allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6911. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP601). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Paul Link

Reg. No. 53,224

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
Telephone (408) 774-6911  
Facsimile (408) 749-6901  
Customer No. 32291